

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 8 and 15 are amended herewith. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17, and 18 are pending and under consideration.

Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because the amendments of claims 1, 8 and 15 should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised. Independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are amended herewith to further emphasize the patentable differences without adding new features or limitations. The claim amendments are fully supported by the original language of the claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Japanese Application Publication 2000-035847 to Hitoshi (hereinafter "Hitoshi") and U.S. Patent No. 5,757,371 to Oran et al. ("Oran"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Hitoshi and Oran alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest at least that "said processing unit [...] displays an external monitor output selection menu in a menu bar of each of the plural window displays, to select said specific window" as recited in claim 1.

Hitoshi discloses a sub-display controlling method in which application windows (21a, 21a, 21c) displayed on a main screen (21) are displayed in sub-displays (22-24) (see Abstract and FIGS. 8-12 of Hitoshi). In FIGS. 9, 10 and 12 of Hitoshi, buttons D1, D2, D3 on the main screen 21 correspond to the sub-displays 22-24, respectively. However, these buttons allow **selecting a sub-display and not a window** from the plurality of windows (e.g. A, B, C therein) to be displayed on an external monitor. Therefore, these buttons do not suggest the "external monitor output selection menu [...] of the plural window displays, **to select said specific window**" whose image the "processing unit [outputs] [...] to an external monitor" as recited in claim 1 (emphasis ours).

The Office Action invokes Oran to supplement Hitachi's alleged teachings relative to the selection menu. Oran discloses a taskbar which supplies "visual cues" for applications having an active window. However, Oran does not correct or compensate for the above-identified failure of Hitachi to teach the "external monitor output selection menu [...] to select said specific window."

Moreover, the Office Action alleges that the motivation for combining Hitoshi and Oran is "to display buttons at a location that is not obscured by the windows." However, this does not appear to be a problem of Hitoshi that needs to be solved by Oran's teachings. The Supreme Court's decision in KSR International. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., et al., 550 U.S. (2007) maintains that the Office Action must establish "an apparent reason to combine ... known elements." (KSR Opinion at page 4) and must expressly articulate the underlying analysis supporting a proffered "apparent reason." Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to substantiate a reason of combining Hitoshi and Oran's teachings.

At least for the above reasons, claim 1 and claims 3-5, 7 and 17 depending from claim 1 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art. Additionally,

Based on the above arguments, claim 8 is patentable over Hitoshi and Oran at least by reciting "displaying an external monitor output selection menu on a menu bar of each window of the display device" wherein image data of the selected widow is output to an external monitor. Claims 10-12, 14 and 18 are also patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from independent claim 8.

Claim 15 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art at least by reciting "displaying an external monitor output selection menu on a menu bar of each window of the display device".

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the "application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/644,006

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Sept. 24, 2007

By: LT Todor
Luminita A. Todor
Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501